

Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday June 5, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien Public Works Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Arn Coombs	Normandy Park
Curt Crawford	King County
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Bob York	Port of Seattle (york.b@portseattle.org) 206-444-4377

Announcements and General Business

There were no edits to the May 1 PMT Meeting Summary. These will be issued as FINAL and posted on the Web site.

ILA Amendment Status - The Amendment was on the Port Commission's agenda for May 27th, but it was bumped to the June 10 meeting. WSDOT has signed it locally, but it has gone to Olympia for final processing. All other parties have signed it and returned it to King County.

Discussion of Consultant Presentations and Data Gaps

There was continued discussion about whether the PMT would find it useful to hear from the ACC regarding their concerns about the basin plan, and whether the PMT would find it useful to have a presentations summarizing what is in the Port's mitigation plan.

Several PMT members expressed an interest in inviting the ACC to tell the PMT their concerns as they relate to the basin plan. Several PMT members felt that if this outreach is not done now, the ACC will bring all their issues up during the public review process, and that hearing their concerns earlier would be better.

Bruce has made another request for data (Water Quality) of the ACC, via Steve Bennett and Steve Clark. Previous requests for ACC water quality data have not been successful.

Action items are highlighted

Bruce confirmed that King County technical staff have gotten information requested from the Port and the Port's consultants (data and details on the mitigation plan), so there is not a driving need to have a presentation on the Port's mitigation plan for the technical staff. The question was again asked whether the PMT was interested in receiving an overview of the Port's mitigation plan. There was some interest, but it was not seen as critical, and the PMT decided to table this issue until later.

Based on the interest to engage the ACC about their concerns, Bruce will craft an invitation for the ACC to come to an upcoming meeting of the PMT to share their concerns as they relate to the Basin Plan development. The ACC will be asked to let Bruce know what they intend to cover and who will be coming to that meeting ahead of time, so that he can determine whether any of the King County technical staff should attend.

The target for this meeting is late June or early July. The July 3 PMT meeting is an option. Additional PMT meetings might be beneficial to keep the momentum going on the project.

Bruce will write the invitation and send it to Steve Clark and Steve Bennett. Steve C. and/or Steve B. will forward the meeting invitation onto the appropriate people at the ACC.

Curt brought up that having the technical team members present at the presentation(s) was not in the original project scope. The PMT confirmed that if tech team members attend the meeting at Bruce's direction based on what the ACC plans to discuss, then this cost is appropriate to be charged to the project budget and reimbursed by the partners.

Discussion of Technical Team Preliminary Findings

Bruce walked through the Technical Team's preliminary findings for the three basins, and the PMT discussed them.

The hydraulic review of each basin included a discussion of flow frequency analysis graphs (for peak flows) generated by the King County modeling staff. The graphs included a few scenarios for future conditions requirements, as summarized below.

NOTE: Several of the terms used in the graphs are not the most useful, and they may be changed to improve clarity (specifically "Future" and "BDHA").

Future (All) represents the added development/redevelopment in the future, without the mitigation associated with the increase in impervious areas either under today's requirements or under what might be required in the future. This is a point of reference used by the modelers, but it is not a realistic scenario. The Salmon model run is labeled "Future with splitter". This model run may be more appropriately called "no mitigation."

BDHA (All) represents the 10% effective impervious condition. This is also referred to as the 75/15/10 line, meaning that it represents flow conditions under a 75% forested, 15% grass, and 10% impervious land cover. This model run may be more appropriately

Action items are highlighted

called "10% effective impervious." [Comment: Curt would advocate calling it the "75/15/10 line" for now – this reference is more descriptive of the actual flow condition of the model run.]

Scene_01 (All) represents a future developed condition where Level 1 flow control (per KC manual) is applied to future new impervious surface. It was computed by modeling the future build-out condition of the basin based on current zoning designations and then simulating the effect of future detention facilities designed to attenuate future condition 2- and 10-year runoff peaks to match current condition 2- and 10-year runoff peaks. The increase in impervious surface used for modeling the future condition was calculated by identifying those parcels in the basin that have an assessed land value greater than the assessed value of the on-site improvements and assuming a future build-out impervious surface coverage consistent with the parcel's current zoning designation. It also included new impervious surface expected on any known large development projects.

In Miller and Walker, the future condition runoff from the Port's property was modeled assuming construction of the third runway and attenuation of runoff per the Port's approved flow mitigation plan. This plan calls for a different and higher flow control standard than the Level 1 standard applied to the rest of the basin (i.e., Level 2 flow control with release rates matching a predevelopment condition of 75% forest, 15% grass, and 10% impervious).

Scene_02 (All) represents a future developed condition where Level 2 flow control (with forested release rates per Ecology manual) is applied to future new and replaced impervious surface. It was computed by modeling the future build-out condition of the basin based on current zoning designations and then simulating the effect of future detention facilities designed to attenuate future condition runoff to match forested condition flow durations and peaks on parcels most likely to create new and replaced impervious surface in the foreseeable future. The parcels that were assumed most likely to add to or replace their existing impervious surface were those identified to have an assessed land value greater than the assessed value of the on-site improvements. On these parcels, the entire future developed runoff was attenuated using simulated Level 2 flow control facilities with release rates matching a fully forested predevelopment condition. For known large development projects, only the impervious surface expected to be new or replaced was assumed to be attenuated in this manner.

In Miller and Walker, the future condition runoff from the Port's property was modeled assuming construction of the third runway and attenuation of runoff per the Port's approved flow mitigation plan. This plan calls for a different and slightly lower flow control standard (i.e., Level 2 with "75/15/10 release rates") than the Level 2 with forested release rates standard applied to the rest of the basin in the Scene_02 model run.

Scene_03 (Walker) represents the Port's mitigation as approved, but NO detention requirements for new impervious anywhere else in the basin.

Discussions

Action items are highlighted

There were questions about what accounts for the difference between the Future with Splitter and Forested runs for Salmon Creek peak flows. Bruce will clarify this information and get back to the PMT.

Scene_03 (as modeled for Walker) will be modeled for Miller as well.

Additional model runs were requested to show the ultimate best flow condition that could be achieved through application of Ecology's August 2001 Stormwater Management Manual standards to all future new development and redevelopment in the Miller and Walker Basin. This would include a run in which the forested release rate Level 2 flow control standard is applied to all new and existing impervious surface on (1) those parcels with an assessed land value greater than the assessed value of on-site improvements (as in Scene_02), and (2) all other commercial parcels in the basin (if significant). It would also include a run in which Ecology's requirement to apply flow control BMPs (a.k.a., Low Impact Development BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable is implemented on all future new development and potential redevelopment sites.

Also requested were comparisons of the flow duration curves for all model runs.

It was discussed that water quality treatment may be a recommendation in the basin plan based on development practices, not necessarily based on specific water quality monitoring results. This is consistent with the overall BMP approach to stormwater management. This is also important given the lack of robust water quality data for these particular basins.

Burien is looking at Chelsea Pond operational modifications with CH2M (which Burien mentioned to Kelly at the last PMT meeting). Bruce will let Kelly know that Burien is still working on this.

The flow frequency diagrams presented were for peak flows. Therefore, the PMT should not discount the potential need (or lack of) for additional detention in the system based only on the peak flow graphs. Bruce will get other graphs from the modelers to help assess this issue.

For everyone's information, part of the Port's mitigation includes base flow augmentation in Miller and Walker.

Schedule and Upcoming Meetings

If you have not already done so, please add PMT meetings to your calendars for the first Thursday of each month (except August) for the rest of 2003. Also please make sure the Executive Committee Meetings are on your calendars. If they are not needed to brief the Executive Committee, they will likely be used as additional PMT meetings. We have a lot to do this year, and we will likely need additional meetings.

Action items are highlighted

Meeting dates to add to your calendars if they're not already there:



Date	Time	Participants
July 3	9AM - Noon	PMT
August 7 August 21	9AM - Noon	PMT RESCHEDULED
August 13	1030-1130 in Cal Hoggard's Office	Executive Committee and PMT (or extra PMT meeting) CANCELLED
September 4	9AM – Noon	PMT
Mid September	? (1 hour)	Executive Committee and PMT to replace August 13 NEED TO SCHEDULE
October 2	9AM – Noon	PMT
October 13 (mid-November)	? (1 hour)	Executive Committee and PMT (or extra PMT meeting) NEED TO SCHEDULE
November 6	9AM – Noon	PMT
December 4	9AM - Noon	PMT
December 15 (mid-December)	? (1 hour)	Executive Committee and PMT (or extra PMT meeting) NEED TO SCHEDULE

PMT meetings will be at Burien City Hall, City Managers Conference Room (upon confirmation of availability from Steve Clark)

Next Meeting

July 3, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Related Attachments

Technical Team Preliminary Findings	 techteamoutline.doc
FINAL 05/01/03 PMT Meeting Summary	 "050103 PMT Meeting Summary.dc

Action items are highlighted

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

FIRST DRAFT

Technical Team preliminary findings for Salmon, Miller, and Walker watersheds

June 5, 2003

Salmon Creek

Goals: Maintain current flow regime by continued use of the by-pass line and improve habitat and water quality where feasible.

Conditions summary and problem identification:

Hydrology

- By-pass line maintains current peak flows at level comparable to 10% impervious land cover
- Future peak flows will stay about the same
- Base flow in upper reach not sufficient to maintain stream flow at all times, but not a high priority given limited area of problem and steep grade

Ecology

- Habitat in upper reach limited
- Middle reach good for salmonids and other species
- Lower reach has significant habitat problems
 - lack of estuary
 - partial fish passage barrier at mouth
 - heavily-armored stream bank
 - culvert under Shorewood Drive

Water Quality

- Data extremely limited
- WQ in stream reflective of urban environment
- WQ in lakes and wetlands poor
- Lake Garrett on 303(d) list for phosphorus and fecal coliforms
- Impacts from vehicles, lawns, and pets – metals, hydrocarbons, detergents, herbicides, pesticides, nutrients, feces

Recommendations:

1. Assess capacity and condition of by-pass line, link with upstream pumping capacity, repair manhole on beach and sub-tidal portions of line
2. Fund and coordinate quantity and quality monitoring to assess effectiveness of projects and programs
3. Develop and implement uniform wq and drainage standards
4. Modify outlet structures at wetlands and lakes to provide wq treatment, construct new regional wq facility upstream of Lake Garrett
5. Revegetate riparian zone, remove invasives; add LWD to stream
6. Retrofit culvert under Shorewood Drive to include baffles
7. Modify lower reach to remove armoring and meander stream
8. Create an estuary

Miller Creek

Goals: Improve current flow regime to more closely approximate a 10% impervious land coverage and improve habitat and water quality where feasible.

Conditions summary and problem identification:

Hydrology

- Current peak flows significantly above 10% impervious level
- Future peak flows will be reduced below current only if Level 2 flow control standard is used
- Base flows appear sufficient in most areas (need additional analysis)

Ecology

- Habitat from Arbor Lake to northern boundary of Port property is poor – armoring, encroachment
- From northern boundary of Port property to 1st Av S culvert habitat is good
- 1st Av S culvert is fish passage barrier at some flows, especially for juveniles; regional detention pond is fish passage barrier
- Lack of estuary

Water Quality

- Data extremely limited
- WQ in stream, lakes, and wetlands reflective of urban environment
- Impacts from vehicles, lawns, and pets – metals, hydrocarbons, detergents, herbicides, pesticides, nutrients, feces

Recommendations:

1. Modify Hermes Depression outflow to augment stream flows and provide wq treatment
2. Fund and coordinate quantity and quality monitoring to assess effectiveness of projects and programs
3. Develop and implement uniform wq and drainage standards
4. Revegetate riparian zone, remove invasives; add LWD and rock to stream
5. Relocate manhole out of stream
6. Modify upper reach to remove armoring and meander stream
7. Construct new regional wq facility at Ambaum Pond
8. Retrofit 1st Av S culvert with baffles
9. Improve habitat just downstream of 1st Av S – remove concrete weirs
10. Create an estuary

Walker Creek

Goals: Improve current flow regime to more closely approximate a 10% impervious land coverage and improve habitat and water quality where feasible.

Conditions summary and problem identification:

Hydrology

- Current peak flows significantly above 10% impervious level
- Future peak flows will be less than current, although still much above 10% impervious level
- Base flows appear sufficient

Ecology

- Headwater fen is large and generally in good condition, provides habitat, flow control, and wq treatment; needs bog protection standard
- Areas of armoring and encroachment
- Lack of estuary

Water Quality

- Data extremely limited
- WQ in stream, lakes, and wetlands reflective of urban environment
- Impacts from vehicles, lawns, and pets – metals, hydrocarbons, detergents, herbicides, pesticides, nutrients, feces

Recommendations:

1. Fund and coordinate quantity and quality monitoring to assess effectiveness of projects and programs
2. Develop and implement uniform wq and drainage standards
3. Revegetate riparian zone, remove invasives
4. Remove armoring
5. Stabilize areas of erosion on Sequoia Creek or provide wq detention
6. Enhance wetland by Des Moines Memorial Drive (#16)
7. Create an estuary

Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday May 1, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien Public Works Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Jeff Jacobson	King County
Kimberly Lockard	King County Council
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac
Kelly Whiting	King County

Announcements and General Business

The PMT confirmed that there were no edits to the March 6 PMT Meeting Summary, and that they can be issued as FINAL.

King County, the City of Burien, and the City of Normandy Park have signed and returned amendment #1 to the ILA. The City of SeaTac has signed the ILA, but it has not yet been returned to King County. **Bruce Bennett will send Mehrdad an electronic copy for WSDOT signature.** The Amendment is on the Port Commission's agenda for May 27th.

Bruce stated that once the ILA Amendment is fully executed, King County will be able to prepare a billing for 2003 work, as well as prepare the billings for WSDOT and Normandy Park for the 2002 work.

Discussion of Consultant Presentations

There was a lengthy discussion about whether the PMT would find it useful to hear presentations on the Port's mitigation plan and the subsequent PCHB decision. The

Action items are highlighted

purpose of such presentations would be to hear a summary of the plan and PCHB decision so that these efforts can be appropriately factored into the basin plan. The purpose is not to debate the adequacy of the mitigation plan or the PCHB response.

This issue was originally raised at a prior meeting, in the context of making sure that the technical team members from King County and the PMT had avenues to get questions answered about the documents.

The PMT reaffirmed that King County staff could talk to the Port's technical consultants directly if they had questions about the technical details of the mitigation plan.

PMT members agreed that there was some benefit in having a presentation by the Port's consultants and by the technical staff working for the ACC. PMT members want to better understand any technical issues that have been raised. These will probably reappear during the public process associated with the basin plan development and adoption.

Because this issue is in litigation, there were concerns that a joint meeting with these parties might not be reasonable, even under controlled conditions with an experienced moderator. Hearing from the parties separately is another option. Because of potential legal concerns, this issue was left with Bob to discuss with his management and legal counsel and get back to Bruce.

Modeling Presentation

Kelly Whiting and Jeff Jacobson were present from King County to follow up on the April 10 modeling presentation, and to present the results of the future conditions modeling runs.

Updated modeling results were presented for the Current, Forested, and BDHA (Biologically Defensible, Hydrologically Achievable) conditions as a result of quality control checks and incorporation of input from the 4/10/03 presentation.

Julie noted that the notes from the April 10 meeting needed a correction – regional facilities are specifically included in the modeling, while residential facilities are not. The notes incorrectly stated that regional facilities were not included.

Dan had additional questions about the Chelsea Pond pump station, and whether it should be included in the model because it has been upgraded. Dan will provide information about the upgraded pump station. King County staff will look at the new information and determine whether it should be specifically incorporated into the model runs.

Kelly presented the approach used by King County staff to identify parcels likely to be redeveloped under the Future Conditions modeling run. These parcels are shown in red in the maps Kelly and Jeff distributed. Parcels were identified as likely to be redeveloped if the improvement value is less than the land value. Kelly looked at some of these parcels individually to verify whether this criterion was reasonable given the actual property conditions and uses. He was satisfied with this criterion. He did remove ravine areas from being flagged by this criterion.

Based on discussions at the meeting, it was identified that this criterion probably identified some partner-owned properties (specifically King County and the City of

Action items are highlighted

Burien) that will not be redeveloped in the future. Kelly will look at the property ownership of the parcels identified for redevelopment, and remove those owned by King County, the City of Burien, or other partners.

Note about parcels identified as likely to be redeveloped. Some parcels likely to be redeveloped may not result in an increase in impervious area. For instance, a parcel that is currently a vacant but paved lot, if redeveloped to a more intensive use, will not necessarily result in an increase in impervious area, even though it is redeveloped. Kelly factored this into his calculations of increased impervious areas for the future conditions.

Kelly asked the PMT to review the maps distributed to identify if there are other large areas of known redevelopment (or if areas shown as redeveloping will probably not be redeveloped). There are several large projects that will be handled in the model in a more specialized way. These include:

- The Hope 6 Project Area (Future model run uses the current conditions for this project area)
- WSDOT 518 Project work (Kelly has information on this, but he needs to review it and incorporate it into the model as appropriate based on the review.)
- Burien North Special Planning Area (Steve C. will provide additional information to Kelly on this project, which includes all new zoning)

Kelly and/or Jeff will provide Julie with the ArcView version of the maps showing the redevelopment areas in red, so that she can distribute them to the PMT members for their use. Note – these maps reflect effective impervious not actual impervious. This is consistent with the standard practice for basin planning.

A special note about the Future Conditions modeling run. The future conditions modeling run is a “base future” run. It represents the added development/redevelopment in the future, **without** the mitigation associated with the increase in impervious areas either under today’s requirements or under what might be required in the future. It is important to understand that the base future scenario is extremely conservative and is, in effect, a “do less than nothing” scenario (i.e., even existing mitigation requirements are ignored). The scenarios will build on this base future condition, using it as a point of reference.

Kelly distributed a hand out that had the impervious area assumptions by zoning categories (for each agency) that were used in the future conditions modeling. He is looking for a quick reality check on those underlying assumptions by the appropriate PMT members.

Under the future conditions, the basins contain 0% forest. While there are stands of trees in some areas as well as individual trees located throughout the basins, the overall assumption of 0% forest is reasonable when compared to the bulk of the land cover.

Summary of changes in impervious acreage from current to future conditions runs:

Salmon Basin impervious area increased from 198 acres to 226 acres

Action items are highlighted

Walker Basin impervious area increased from 174 acres to 236 acres (includes STIA areas)

Miller Basin impervious area increased from 844 acres to 977 acres (includes STIA areas, but not WSDOT; WSDOT improvements will be included in future model runs)

It was suggested that Kelly overlay the SAO and KC wetland GIS layer on the map showing the parcels presumed for redevelopment, and remove any red parcels that are within the SAO or wetlands areas.

Kelly's phone number is 206-263-6053.

Next Meeting

June 5, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon
City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

Related Attachments

FINAL 03/06/03 PMT Meeting Summary



"030603 PMT
Meeting Summary.do

Action items are highlighted

Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday March 6, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien Public Works Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Julie Cairn	King County
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Arn Coombs	Gray and Osborne Engineers for the City of Normandy Park
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac

Announcements and General Business

Bruce distributed printed copies of the ILA Amendment for Partners to have signed by their Agency signatory. Amendment #1 reduces the cost share for WSDOT from 10% to 1%, and it adds the City of Normandy Park as a Project Partner, with a cost share of 9%.

Bruce will send out an electronic copy of the Amendment to the PMT members as well, to help expedite the signature gathering. The email version will include the return mailing address for the signed documents (ATTN: Lee Ann Merrill).

Please try to get the signed copies back to Lee Ann by March 21st.

The PMT confirmed that there were no additional edits to the February 6 PMT Meeting Summary. Edits received will be incorporated, and the February 6 PMT Meeting Summary will be issued as FINAL.

Raw vs. Filtered Problem List

Several weeks ago, Bruce sent out the list of “raw” problems in email. As part of that “raw” information, he also sent out an Excel file containing customer complaint information for the Miller/Walker and Salmon basins from about 1970 to late 2002. This data was extracted from the King County drainage complaint database.

Bruce reviewed the scope of the “raw list” and the path that led from the “raw list” to the “filtered list.” The “raw list” includes the information in the customer complaint database

Action items are highlighted

and information gathered by King County staff (Louise and Doug) when meeting with each Project Partner to discuss their goals and concerns for the basin planning effort. These interviews also discussed known or perceived drainage problems in each jurisdiction.

PMT members asked if King County could provide some analysis of the complaint data, so that the approximately 1400 complaint records would be more useful in the context of the planning effort.

Project Schedule Approach

Bruce handed out an updated project schedule, and walked through it with the PMT members.

On the schedule, the tasks are organized based on the participants (PMT, executive committee, elected officials, and the public). It was suggested that color coding the tasks by the activity or work product would improve the schedule readability.

The schedule was discussed, and some modifications were made. The PMT agreed with the overall approach as discussed. See discussion below about public information strategy approaches.

The PMT also reconfirmed their desire to have the King County technical team make recommendations for preliminary problem prioritization and solutions development (for both Salmon and Miller/Walker basins).

The proposed schedule, as discussed, includes developing and getting feedback on a Public Information Strategy Summary document by early April, and for briefing the Executive Team and the Elected Officials in April/May.

Public Outreach Strategy

Media outreach was discussed. It was suggested that it include:

- Highline Times article (Developed with input from all partners. **Approved by the Executive Committee prior to release.** Submitted on behalf of all partners. Release coordinated by Burien Public Information Officer.)
- Agency/City newsletters (each agency to take care of using content developed above)
- Agency/City Government TV channels (each agency to take care of using content developed above)
- Radio (maybe) – using content developed above and coordinated by City of Burien Public Information Officer.
- Web – using content developed above, posted on the Project Web Site by King County staff.

Consistency in the information delivered is very important.

Steve Clark has volunteered the assistance of Burien's Public Information Officer (Susan Wineke, 206-439-3167, susanw@ci.burien.wa.us)

Action items are highlighted

Public Meetings – The proposed schedule has a slightly modified public meeting approach than that discussed at the last PMT meeting. This was discussed. The approach on the schedule was generally acceptable, with the following caveat: meetings to discuss Salmon basin issues should be held **separately** from meetings held to discuss Miller/Walker basin issues.

Reminder to PMT members: Each agency needs to make sure they are talking to their respective executives and elected officials before the public meetings roll around.

Work Product Needed – 1 or 2 page Public Outreach Strategy Summary to share with Executive Committee in April. **Bruce to draft and get feedback from PMT members so this can be finalized very early in April.**

Fact Sheet and Basin Plan Document Discussions

The group discussed the Project Fact Sheet in general terms (this had not been on the official agenda). A few general comments came up that we need to make sure are reflected in the Fact Sheet. They are:

The scope of the existing ILA should be clear – planning only, not implementation

The purpose of the plan is to develop recommendations based on technical merits. Implementability and political issues may affect implementation and funding priorities, but the plan is to be technically based.

As technical options are outlined in the plan, supporting materials need to be provided (pros and cons and costs) as available and appropriate.

Provide discussion and assurances of the joint decision-making processes that are envisioned for follow on steps/projects.

Presentations to PMT by Consultants*

The PMT had requested a presentation by the Port's consultants regarding the information in the Port's mitigation plan. The purpose of the presentation request was **not** to discuss the merits or faults of the mitigation plan or of the proposed third runway project, but simply to gain a better understanding of the content of the mitigation plan. Because of concerns raised by King County Councilmember Julia Patterson, the presentation by the Port's consultants will be cancelled. Instead, Bob Duffner, the Port's PMT representative, has suggested that he and Robin Kordic, another Port employee, give an overview of the content of the mitigation plan. The PMT will decide at a future date if there will be a presentation on the Pollution Control Hearings Board decision regarding the Port's mitigation plan. If it is decided that a presentation would be useful, it will be given by a member or members of the PMT.

While it is the intent of the PMT to be informed of technical issues relevant to development of the basin plan, it is not the PMT's intent or charge to debate, evaluate, support, or oppose the Port's mitigation plan or the third runway project.

Action items are highlighted

*Further discussion of this topic occurred after the meeting. The PMT may wish to revisit this topic at its next meeting.

Phasing of the Basin Plan

The concept of phasing the basin plan has been discussed separately by King County Councilmember Julia Patterson and the City of Burien on several occasions. The PMT decided that the basin plan can't be phased because it is not technically feasible to do so. Any attempt to consider only part of the watershed (specifically, those parts not affected by the proposed third runway project) is not consistent with the concept of basin planning, which is to consider the watershed as a complete, inter-related unit, with all parts of the watershed functioning in concert. If parts of the watershed were ignored, then it would not be possible to develop meaningful descriptions of problems, hydrologic models, or potential solutions.

Executive Committee Meetings

Upon reviewing the schedule, it is time to schedule several Executive Committee Meetings. The City of Burien has offered to work with the Executive Committee members to get several meetings set up –

- Early April (the first week of the month if possible)
- Mid May
- Mid August

PMT Members are encouraged to attend the Executive Committee Meetings

Steve Clark summarized the agenda items for the April Executive Committee meeting as follows: address issues from the last Executive Committee meeting, review project schedule, and review public involvement strategy.

Upcoming Meetings and Topics

April 3, 2003 PMT Meeting has been **CANCELLED**.

- Work on the Public Involvement Strategy Summary document will occur via email (in preparation for the Executive Committee Meeting).

Executive Committee meetings will include PMT Members (next one in early April some time)

April 10, 2003 Modeling results technical presentation for both basins – 2 to 3:30 in the Chinook conference room, 6th floor, King Street Center

May 1, 2003 PMT Meeting 9AM – Noon City of Burien City Manager's Conference Room

- The Parametrix presentation has been cancelled (see above). A PMT member will present information about the Port's mitigation plan.

Action items are highlighted

- Discuss modeling results
- Discuss public outreach content to forward to Exec Committee for action at mid-May Executive Committee meeting.

Related Attachments (double click icon to open file)

FINAL 2/6/03 PMT Meeting Summary	 "020603 PMT Meeting Summary.do
Gantt Chart (incorporating formatting comments at the meeting) – LARGE FORMAT BEST PRINTED ON A PLOTTER	 gantt.xls

Action items are highlighted

FINAL